

Dynamics of Intergenerational Influences on Brand Preferences in Pakistan: (Brand-in-Mind VS Brand-in-Hand)

Khalid Hussain ^{a,*}, Kamran Ahmed Siddiqui ^b

^a Pakistan Institute of Management, Karachi, Pakistan

^b University of Dammam, Saudi Arabia

ARTICLE INFO

JEL Classification:
M31

Keywords:
Branding
Intergenerational Influence (IGI)
Brand-in-mind
Brand-in-use

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the existence of (IGI) between two successive generations for their brands preferences in Pakistan. A sample of 80 mother-daughter dyads, and 80 father-son dyad was selected each (Total respondents =320). The frequency count of agreements for 17 product categories was obtained and those product categories were selected which had at least 50% response rate. The proportion of agreement between parent and child were found to be more than 50% in Smart Phones, Laptops, Desktops, Toothpaste, Toothbrush, Shampoo, National dress, Formal Shoes, Jeans, Fast Foods, Cold Drinks, Juices, Tea, and Ice cream product categories. All these proportions appeared to be statistically significant. This means that there is an existence of IGI in all these 14 product groups which is statistically significant. The difference of proportion of agreements in use versus in mind appeared to be statistically significant in Mobile Phones, Smart Phones, Desktops, Toothpaste, Shampoo, Formal Shoes, Jeans, Fast Foods, and Juices product category. Thus agreements brand-in-use situation between parent and child are more than agreements brand-in-mind situation. These results reflect that there is a significant evidence of IGI presence between parent and adult child. Hence brand preferences are definitely going to be transferred from one generation to the other, this phenomenon is more prominent for those brands which are in use than those which are in mind.

Journal of Marketing Management and Consumer Behavior

*Corresponding Author:
Kha151@yahoo.com

1. Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the existence of (IGI) between two successive generations for their brands preferences for different product categories in Pakistan. It has measured the preference match between Brand-in-Mind and Brand-in-Use as Intergenerational Influences (IGI) on brand preferences.

2. Literature Review

Intergenerational influence (IGI) is an old term covered in literature many decades back (Amdt, 1971) and recently emerged at a crossroad of many disciplines like sociology, psychology and behavioral sciences especially consumer behavior. It refers to the transmission of attitudes, skills, values, and behaviors from one generation to another generation (Heckler, Childers & Arunachalam, 1989; Moschis 1988). Sociologically this phenomenon explains the dynamics of transferring brand preferences from parents to the adult children (Moore, 2002). IGI in the area of politics and religion reveals that parents transmit political affiliations and religious beliefs to their children. They also transmit influence on gender orientation, achievement orientation, and racial attitudes (Elizabeth, William, Richard, 2002).

IGI can prevail within family and intra family. Within family scenario it influences consumer behaviors like information search, evaluative criteria, brand selection, and receptivity to marketing mix elements (Shah & Mittal, 1997). In case of interfamily, IGI shapes decision about product class, preferences about brand loyalty, and deal proneness. The two major findings about IGI in marketing area are that children do receive brand preferences from their parents in different product categories. The impact of IGI can vary in different product categories but it exists. Secondly, IGI tends to decline as children get mature and starts to live independently (Perez, Padgett & Burgers, 2011).

Intergenerational influence is perceived to flow from parent to children but at times it gets reversed from adult children to parents. This generally happens when parents need to buy some technological products. There they seek advice from their adult children as they are considered more knowledgeable in new technologies. Therefore this influence is greater from adult children to parents in these purchases. Whereas IGI will be more from parents to adult children in case of traditional products (Shah & Mittal, 1997). Though there is a strong evidence for intergenerational influence transfer from one generation to the other but there is also evidences that these influences decline because of age, marital status, and gender

(Heckler 1989; Shah & Mittal 1997). IGI impacts association with in-home visibility for packaged goods. So these studies show that product categories can affect IGI levels (Moore-Shay & Lutz, 1988). IGI is more likely to affect consumer preferences for convenience products than in case of shopping products (Heckler, Childers, and Arumachalam 1989).

This study has distinctions on many counts over previous studies. Firstly, it examines the IGI existence between parent and adult child in different product categories. Parents include both mother and father whereas adult children include daughter and son both. Previously most of the studies were focused on only one gender dyad i.e., mother-daughter or father-son dyads to examine how much mothers/fathers exert their influence in shaping the brand preferences of their children in different product categories (Moore-Shay & Lutz, 1988; Maria, Padgett, Willem, 2011; Mandrik, Fern, & Bao, 2004). Current study focuses on both genders equally. Secondly the degree of IGI between parent and child was examined for brand-in-mind versus brand-in-use situations for several product categories. This aspect is almost absent in all of the previous studies. Thirdly, previous studies suggest that IGI affects the consumer preferences for convenience products than in the case of shopping products. Current study has included both convenience products and shopping products. Fourth, IGI on brand preference is mainly observed in collectivist societies instead of individualist societies (Perez, Padgett & Burgers, 2011). This study is conducted in Pakistan, where scores on collectivism is high. A lot of work has been done in different parts of the world and presented remarkable results about intergenerational influence on brand preferences such as in America, Mexico, Taiwan etc, but there is rare such work in developing countries like Pakistan. Some local studies have a major contribution on the subject area in Pakistan. One study analyzed the underlying structure of Intergenerational influences (IGI) on brand preferences. They have suggested that IGI on brand preferences for durable goods structurally differs with consumer goods (Siddiqui, Bashir, Sarki, Jaffari, & Abbas, 2012). Another study suggested that women dyads (mother-daughter) agreements are statistically higher than the proportions of men dyads (father-son) agreements (Hussain & Siddiqui, 2015). Other minor work on this subject area include work on influence of elder's suggestions in the usage of fertilizer branding (Siddiqui, Ahmad, Manan, & Choudhary, 2013); in choosing a telecom brand (Siddiqui, Ali, Sarki, Khuhro, 2015); in shaping women's perceptions towards branded clothing (Khakhan & Siddiqui, 2015); in establishing the bases of Islamic branding (Jumani & Siddiqui, 2012) and branding by Islamic banks (Ishtiaq & Siddiqui, 2016).

3. Methodology

Population was defined as mother – daughter dyads and father – son dyads belonging to middle and upper-middle classes. The life style of these families was progressive assured that these families have already used most of the brands in the selected list of product categories they had brand preferences in different product categories.

Three focus groups were conducted to identify items for which intergenerational influence (IGI) shall be identified. These focus groups were comprised of fathers, mothers, sons, and daughters. 38 items were identified. These product categories were grouped into four clusters and are named as (1) Consumer Electronics, (2) Personal care, (3) Life style products, and (4) Food and beverages. Therefore Mobile Phone, Smart Phones, Laptops, and Desktops were grouped with the name of Consumer Electronics, Toothpaste, Toothbrush, Soap, and Shampoo were grouped together with the name of Personal Care, Wristwatch, National dress, Jeans, Formal Shoes, and Car were grouped together with the name of Life Style, and finally Fast-food, Cold Drinks, Juices, Tea, and Ice-cream were grouped together with the name of Foods and Beverages. Additionally product categories having majority of failed brands were also identified (Saeed & Siddiqui, 2015; Saeed & Siddiqui, 2016; Khaqan, Siddiqui & Siddiqui, 2016).

Families (mother – daughter dyads and father – son dyads) have been selected as sampling units. 80 dyads of mother-daughter and 80 dyads of father-son are selected for data collection using Judgmental sampling. A total sample of 320 respondents (80 fathers and their 80 sons, 80 mothers and their 80 daughters) was selected considered adequate as per sampling guidelines (Siddiqui, 2013).

Questionnaire was formed with the identification of 38 product categories during three focus groups discussions. These 38 product categories were placed with the vacant spaces corresponding to the columns of Brand-in-mind and Brand-in-use for respondents' identification of brands in those spaces respectively. Questionnaire also includes demographic information about respondents on gender, marital status, living with parents, age, and income. Name, addresses, and telephone numbers were not required in order to encourage the respondents' candor responses. Universities students and their families were selected and separate interviews were conducted with father, son, mother, and daughter to avoid bias from family members. 50% response rate was selected as standard for a product category to stay in the analysis. If response rate is less than 50% then IGI detection would not

be possible. Another criterion for data screening was the high fragmentation of brand choices which resulted in a 25 or more brand selection by respondents. This situation showed that brand preferences were widely scattered and cannot be converted into a meaningful analysis. Based on these criteria, following product categories were dropped from further analysis; Palmtop, Tablet PC, Face wash, Mask, Creamer, Shower Gel, T-Shirt, Hand Bags, Sandals, Casual Shoes, Lipstick, Nail Polish, Face Powder, Eye Shades, Perfume, Deodorant, Sunglasses, and Lenses. Questionnaires received in group form (son and father, daughter and mother) were screened for any data manipulations. If any group answers were copied from each other, questionnaires were dropped from data coding and feeding.

Ethical issues related to this research study were given the highest importance. In this regard, respondents were not asked for their personal information like their names, addresses, or telephone numbers so that their privacy was not affected. No classified information was sought. All the information obtained was kept confidential without giving any chance to any irrelevant individual to have an exposure of it.

One of the limitations of the study is its geographical restrictions. Funding agencies made it clear at the award of the project that geographical boundaries for the project would be restricted to Karachi city areas because of time and resource limitations.

4. Analyses

The data was analyzed in two steps. At first step analysis includes frequency distributions for brands-in-mind and brand-in-use for parents and children for 17 product categories. Table 1, 2, 3 and 4 show frequency distributions of top three brands in Consumer Electronics, Personal Care, Life Style and Food and Beverage categories respectively. These tables show frequency counts of different brands as selected by respondents brand-in-mind and brand-in-use categories. Table 5 shows the show the agreements between father and son, or between mother and daughter dyads. This data is tabulated for Brand-in-mind, brand-in-use and total for 17 different product categories. All tables are self explanatory and provide enormous information for practicing marketing/brand managers.

Table 1

IGI preferences (Brand-in-Mind VS Brand-in-Use) – Consumer Electronics

Category	Brand-in-Mind						Brand-in-Use					
	Child Preferences			Parent Preferences			Child Preferences			Parent Preferences		
	#	Brand	%	#	Brand	%	#	Brand	%	#	Brand	%
Mobile Phone	1	Nokia	31	1	Nokia	46	1	Nokia	49	1	Nokia	67
	2	Apple	29	2	Apple	20	2	Samsung	22	2	Samsung	16
	3	Samsung	21	3	Samsung	17	3	HTC	9	3	HTC	5
Smart Phone	1	Apple	57	1	Apple	70	1	Apple	27	1	Samsung	28
	2	Samsung	19	2	Samsung	12	2	Samsung	23	2	HTC	23
	3	HTC	13	3	BlackBerry	7	3	HTC	19	3	Apple	21
Laptop	1	Apple	39	1	Apple	47	1	HP	38	1	Dell	38
	2	HP	23	2	HP	22	2	Dell	31	2	HP	29
	3	Dell	19	3	Dell	18	3	Acer	6	3	Apple	8
Desktop	1	Dell	51	1	Dell	55	1	Dell	59	1	Dell	61
	2	Intel	17	2	HP	24	2	HP	19	2	HP	20
	3	HP	15	3	Intel	10	3	Intel	15	3	Intel	10

Table 2

IGI preferences (Brand-in-Mind VS Brand-in-Use) – Personal Care

Category	Brand-in-Mind						Brand-in-Use					
	Child Preferences			Parent Preferences			Child Preferences			Parent Preferences		
	#	Brand	%	#	Brand	%	#	Brand	%	#	Brand	%
Toothpaste	1	Colgate	72	1	Colgate	66	1	Colgate	70	1	Colgate	66
	2	Close-up	7	2	Close-up	11	2	Close-up	8	2	Close-up	9
	3	Sensodyne	6	3	Sensodyne	4	3	Sensodyne	6	3	Sensodyne	6
Toothbrush	1	Oral-B	48	1	Oral-B	53	1	Oral-B	40	1	Oral-B	41
	2	Colgate	32	2	Shield	22	2	Colgate	35	2	Colgate	28
	3	Shield	16	3	Colgate	21	3	Shield	17	3	Shield	24
Soap	1	Lux	37	1	Lux	46	1	Lux	39	1	Lux	43
	2	Dove	23	2	Dove	17	2	Dove	14	2	Dove	10
	3	Safeguard	8	3	Capri	7	3	Safeguard	14	3	Safeguard	10
Shampoo	1	Sunsilk	23	1	Pantene	24	1	Sunsilk	28	1	Sunsilk	26
	2	H&S	17	2	Sunsilk	21	2	H&S	28	2	H&S	23
	3	Dove	13	3	H&S	21	3	Dove	14	3	Pantene	20

Table 3

IGI preferences (Brand-in-Mind VS Brand-in-Use) – Life Style

Category	Brand-in-Mind						Brand-in-Use					
	Child Preferences			Parent Preferences			Child Preferences			Parent Preferences		
	#	Brand	%	#	Brand	%	#	Brand	%	#	Brand	%
Watches		Rolex	25	1	Rado	28	1	Casio	14	1	Rado	15
		Rado	19	2	Rolex	23	2	Rado	12	2	Seiko	15
		Tagheur	10	3	Tissot	12	3	Seiko	7	3	Citizen	14
National dress	1	GulAhmad	25	1	Gul Ahmad	37	1	GulAhmad	26	1	Gul Ahmad	35
	2	J.J.	23	2	J.J.	14	2	J.J.	20	2	AlKaram	16
	3	Khadi	11	3	.AlKaram	14	3	Khadi	11	3	J.J.	10
Jeans	1	Levis	62	1	Levis	79	1	Levis	70	1	Levis	76
	2	Stoneage	6	2	Stone age	3	2	Outfitters	7	2	Stoneage	4
	3	Armani	6	3	Armani	3	3	Stoneage	7	3	Outfitters	3
Shoes	1	EBH	24	1	EBH	32	1	EBH	24	1	EBH	29
	2	Gucci	7	2	Stylo	8	2	Hush puppy	10	2	Bata	8
	3	Hush Pupy	7	3	Fitrite	6	3	Bata	9	3	Stylo	7

Table 4

IGI preferences (Brand-in-Mind VS Brand-in-Use) – Food & Beverages

Category	Brand-in-Mind						Brand-in-Use					
	Child Preferences			Parent Preferences			Child Preferences			Parent Preferences		
	#	Brand	%	#	Brand	%	#	Brand	%	#	Brand	%
Fast food	1	McDonalds	23	1	McDonalds	35	1	KFC	29	1	McDonalds	36
	2	KFC	22	2	KFC	27	2	McDonalds	22	2	KFC	29
	3	Pizza Hut	10	3	Pizza Hut	13	3	Pizza Hut	14	3	Pizza Hut	12
Soft drink	1	Pepsi	44	1	Coke	41	1	Pepsi	42	1	Pepsi	36
	2	Coke	30	2	Pepsi	36	2	Coke	28	2	Coke	33
	3	7-Up	8	3	7-Up	15	3	7-Up	11	3	7-Up	16
Juices	1	Nestle	66	1	Nestle	68	1	Nestle	65	1	Nestle	70
	2	Slice	10	2	Slice	8	2	Slice	13	2	Slice	11
	3	Shezan	2	3	Froto	6	3	Rani	3	3	Fresh	5
Tea	1	Lipton	68	1	Lipton	52	1	Lipton	58	1	Lipton	49
	2	Tapal	25	2	Tapal	46	2	Tapal	36	2	Tapal	46
	3	Others	7	3	Others	2	3	Others	6	3	Others	6
Ice-cream	1	Walls	37	1	Walls	33	1	Walls	56	1	Walls	55
	2	Movenpick	19	2	Omoro	13	2	Omoro	15	2	Omoro	25
	3	Omoro	10	3	Movenpick	8	3	Gilato	6	3	Igloo	7

Table 5

IGI Agreements on Brand preferences (Brand-in-Mind VS Brand-in-Use)

Product Category	Products	Intergenerational (Child-Parent) Agreements on Brand Preferences				
		Brand in Mind		Brand in Use		Total
<u>Consumer Electronics</u>	Mobile Phones	53		84	*	137
	Smart Phone	41	*	17		58
	Laptop	93		100	*	193
	Desktop Computer	77		105	*	182
<u>Personal Care</u>	Toothpaste	89		95	*	184
	Toothbrush	73		87	*	160
	Soap	56		69	*	125
	Shampoo	73		105	*	178
<u>Life Style</u>	Wrist Watch	69		73	*	142
	National dress	76		82	*	158
	Jeans	95		119	*	214
	Formal Shoes	84		98	*	182
<u>Food & Beverages</u>	Fast Food	46		65	*	111
	Cold Drink	40		76	*	116
	Juices	56		82	*	138
	Tea	58		99	*	157
	Ice Cream	46		64	*	110

* Greater & significant

5. Findings

This research provides three important findings in Pakistani scenario. Firstly, it supports and augments the worldwide phenomena of Intergenerational influences in Pakistan. According to those results, the presence of intergenerational influence (IGI) is statistically proven all product categories. Secondly, the presence of IGI is greater in actual brands consumption than brands in mind. This means that there is a greater commonality between parent and adult child in brand selection for actual consumption than having a desire for a brand in mind. Mobile Phones, Desktops, Shampoo, Jeans, Fast Foods, and Juices are the product categories where IGI presence is more statistically significant in actual consumption of brands than brands in mind. Mobile Phones, Toothpaste, Shampoo, and Jeans are individually used product whereas Desktops, Fast Foods, and Juices are household products. But in any case these are the most commonly used products. Therefore brands knowledge and preferences are shared. Smart Phone is the only product category where IGI presence is more statistically significant in brands-in-minds situation than brands-in-use. There is no difference in

agreement proportions in mind versus use in the rest of the product categories. This is quite obvious that those products which are technologically sophisticated and expensive create a high level of desires in minds of consumers. But it may not result into the actual consumption of the product. Smart Phones category is an example of such situation. That is why in mind agreement proportion is statistically more significant than that of in use. Thirdly, dominance of top three brands has been exhibited in all product categories. These three brands hold more than 70% of the total product consumption in a particular category. This means that three brands occupy distinct and strong positions in the minds of consumers. Marketers of those brands should solidify their brands positioning in the minds and hearts of their target consumers. This can ensure their market standings; still other small pockets of the market are available for other brands. For any other brand to occupy the leading position in the market place other than those which already established, some breakthrough is required.

6. Conclusions

The strength of intergenerational influence (IGI) is varying across various product categories. All those product categories which are commonly used by parents and adult children, the presence of IGI is relatively high. Examples of such product categories include Desktop computers, Laptops, Toothpaste, Tooth Brush, Shampoo, Shoes, Jeans, Juices, and Tea. Knowing these insights should be converted into a marketing plan to take advantage.

Proportions of agreements in actual use situation are found to be greater than proportions of agreement in mind situations in majority of the product categories. This implies that real time exposures and interaction with brands of parents and their adult children are more important than just acquiring information about some brands. It may also imply that brand preferences are more transferred from parents to adult children or from adult children to parents in actual experience and use of the brands.

7. References

- Amdt, J., (1971). A Research Note on Intergenerational overlap of selected consumer variables *Markeds Kommunikasjan*, 8(3), pp:1-8
- Cai, Y., Zhao, G., & He, J. (2015). Influences of two modes of intergenerational communication on brand equity. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(3), pp:553-560.
- Elizabeth S.M., William L.W., Richard J.L., (2002) Passing the Torch: Intergenerational Influences as a Source of Brand Equity *Journal of Marketing*, 66(2) pp:17-37.
- Heckler, S.E., Childers, T.E. & Arunachalam, R. (1989), Intergenerational Influences in Adult Buying Behaviors: An Examination of Moderating Factors, *Advances in Consumer Research*, Association for Consumer Research, pp:276-284.

- Hussain, K., & Siddiqui, K.A., (2015). Women dyads have Higher IGI on brand preferences, *Science International*, 28(1), pp: 509-512
- Ishtiaq, S.M., & Siddiqui, K.A., (2016). Branding by Islamic Banks in Pakistan: A Content Analysis of Visual Brand Elements, *Journal of Marketing Management and Consumer Behavior*, 1 (2), pp: 32-43
- Jumani, Z., & Siddiqui, K., (2012). Bases of Islamic Branding in Pakistan, *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research In Business*, 3(9) pp: 840-847
- Khaqan, M., & Siddiqui, K.A., (2015) Women's Perceptions Towards Branded Clothing In Pakistan *Science International*, (Lahore), 27(5), pp: 4661-4665
- Khaqan, M., Siddiqui, A.K., & Siddiqui, K.A., (2016) Brand Failure: Content Analytic Findings from Pakistan, *Journal of Marketing Management and Consumer Behavior* 1 (3), pp: 13-28
- Mandrik, C.A., Fern, E.F., & Bao, Y., (2004). Intergenerational influence in mothers and young adults daughters. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 31, 697-699.
- Moore, E.S., Wilkie, W.L., & Lutz, R.J. (2002). Passing the torch: intergenerational influences as a source of brand equity. *Journal of Marketing*, 66(2), 17-37.
- Moore-Shay, E.S., & Lutz, R.J. (1988). Intergenerational influences in the formation of consumer attitudes and beliefs about the marketplace: mothers and daughters. *Advances in consumer research*, 15(1), pp:461-467.
- Moschis, G.P. (1988), Methodological Issues in Studying Intergenerational Influences on Consumer Behavior *Advances in Consumer Research*, Association for Consumer Research, pp:461-467.
- Perez, M. E., Padgett, D., & Burgers, W. (2011). Intergenerational influence on brand preferences. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 20(1), pp:5-13.
- Saeed. K., & Siddiqui, K.A., (2015). Brand Failure & Product Life Cycle: Descriptive Analyses *Science International*, (Lahore), 27(5), pp: 4655-4659
- Saeed. K., & Siddiqui, K.A., (2016). Brand Failure: Factor Analytic Findings, *Journal of Marketing Management and Consumer Behavior* 1 (3), pp: 1-12
- Shah, R.H. & Mittal, B., (1997). Toward a Theory of Intergenerational Influence in Consumer Behavior: an Exploratory Essay, in NA - *Advances in Consumer Research* Volume 24, eds. Merrie Brucks and Deborah J. MacInnis, Provo, UT : Association for Consumer Research, Pages: 55-60.
- Siddiqui, K., (2013). Heuristics for Sample Size Determination in Multivariate Statistical Techniques, *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 27(2): pp 285-287
- Siddiqui, K., Ahmad, R., Manan, A., & Choudhary, D., (2013). Fertilizer Branding in Pakistan, *International Journal of Marketing and Technology*, 3(9) pp: 82-92.
- Siddiqui, K., Bashir, S., Sarki, I.H., Jaffari, S.I.A., & Abbas, S. (2012). Intergenerational influences on Brand preferences: Consumables VS Durables, *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(14) pp: 840-847
- Siddiqui, K.A., Ali, M., Sarki, I.H., Khuhro, R.A., (2015) Telecom Branding in Pakistan: Network Coverage or Value Added Services, *Academic Journal of Research in Economics and Management*, 3(3), pp: 61-66